

Union Calendar No. 213

104th Congress, 1st Session - - - - - House Report 104-438

VOICES FOR CHANGE

SIXTH REPORT

BY THE

**COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
REFORM AND OVERSIGHT**

DECEMBER 21, 1995.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

★ 29-006 CC

WASHINGTON : 1996

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr., Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York	CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
DAN BURTON, Indiana	HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland	TOM LANTOS, California
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut	ROBERT E. WISE, Jr., West Virginia
STEVEN SCHIFF, New Mexico	MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida	EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
WILLIAM H. ZELIFF, Jr., New Hampshire	JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., South Carolina
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York	LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California	PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
JOHN L. MICA, Florida	GARY A. CONDIT, California
PETER BLUTE, Massachusetts	COLLIN C. PETERSON, Minnesota
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia	KAREN L. THURMAN, Florida
DAVID M. McINTOSH, Indiana	CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
JON D. FOX, Pennsylvania	THOMAS M. BARRETT, Wisconsin
RANDY TATE, Washington	GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
DICK CHRYSLER, Michigan	BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS, Michigan
GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana	JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia
WILLIAM J. MARTINI, New Jersey	GENE GREEN, Texas
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida	CARRIE P. MEEK, Florida
JOHN B. SHADEGG, Arizona	FRANK MASCARA, Pennsylvania
MICHAEL PATRICK FLANAGAN, Illinois	CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
CHARLES F. BASS, New Hampshire	
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio	BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, South Carolina	(Independent)
ROBERT L. EHRLICH, Jr., Maryland	
	JAMES L. CLARKE, <i>Staff Director</i>
	KEVIN SABO, <i>General Counsel</i>
	JUDITH McCoy, <i>Chief Clerk</i>
	BUD MYERS, <i>Minority Staff Director</i>

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL SERVICE

JOHN M. McHUGH, New York, *Chairman*

MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD, South Carolina	BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS, Michigan
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York	MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut	GENE GREEN, Texas
DAVID M. McINTOSH, Indiana	CARRIE P. MEEK, Florida
ROBERT L. EHRLICH, Jr., Maryland	

EX OFFICIO

WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr., Pennsylvania	CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
	DAN BLAIR, <i>Staff Director</i>
	ROBERT TAUB, <i>Professional Staff Member</i>
	MERYL COOPER, <i>Clerk</i>
	DENISE WILSON, <i>Minority Professional Staff</i>

(II)

(II)

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 21, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By direction of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, I submit herewith the committee's sixth report to the 104th Congress.

WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr.,
Chairman.

(III)

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Background	2
Results in Brief	2
Principal Findings	3
Key Issues	3
Subcommittee Hears That Reform Is Needed	5
Despite the Voices for Change, Little Consensus Emerges	5
Summary of Testimony	6
Additional Hearings: H.R. 1963 and Is It Time for Change?	9
Appendix I—General Oversight Hearings 1995	11

Union Calendar No. 213

104TH CONGRESS } 1st Session	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	{ REPORT 104-438
---------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------

VOICES FOR CHANGE

DECEMBER 21, 1995.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. CLINGER, from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, submitted the following

SIXTH REPORT

On December 14, 1995, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight approved and adopted a report entitled “Voices for Change.” The chairman was directed to transmit a copy to the Speaker of the House.

INTRODUCTION

During the first session of the 104th Congress, the Subcommittee on the Postal Service conducted ten hearings, the first eight providing general oversight and review of the operations of the U.S. Postal Service—a government monopoly that accounts for about \$54 billion in annual revenue. The ninth hearing focused on H.R. 1963, introduced by the Chairman, and the final hearing—“The Postal Reorganization Act 25 Years Later, Is It Time for Change”—set the stage for the Subcommittee’s 1996 agenda.

Unlike most other executive branch entities, the Postal Service touches the lives of all American households and businesses every day. Whether the issues relate to the quality of delivery service, the money paid for postage, or the impact of this government corporation on the lives of its approximately 850,000 employees, the American public has basic concerns about the effectiveness and efficiency of postal operations.

As the Subcommittee prepared to begin hearings to scrutinize proposals for fundamental reform of the Postal Service, Chairman McHugh undertook this review of the oversight hearings to determine: (1) the key issues regarding the future role of the U.S. Postal Service that emerged in the hearings; (2) whether witnesses expressed a need for reform of the laws that govern the U.S. mail

system; and (3) the specific legislative changes, if any, on which consensus emerged among the witnesses.

BACKGROUND

From February 23 through July 25, 1995, the Subcommittee on the Postal Service held oversight hearings to explore the operations of the Postal Service and discuss the need for reform of the current system. The Subcommittee heard testimony from the Postmaster General on two occasions, the General Accounting Office, the Postal Rate Commission, the Postal Service's Board of Governors, major mailing groups, postal union and management associations, postal-dependent businesses and competitors, and the Inspector General of the Postal Service. These witnesses represent a broad spectrum of stakeholders in the Postal Service. All of the Subcommittee's hearings are summarized at the end of this report, and Appendix I lists the hearing dates and witnesses.

RESULTS IN BRIEF

Four key issues emerged in the oversight hearings, including the mail monopoly, labor-management relations, ratemaking, and new postal products. First, much of the testimony received by the Subcommittee indicated that Congress may need to address the extent to which, if at all, the Postal Service's exclusive right to deliver letter mail should be repealed or substantially reduced in scope. Second, with longstanding labor relations problems persisting on the workroom floor, it became clear that Congress must consider how it can encourage and assist postal management and unions to address these severe problems. Third, many witnesses documented long delays and conflicts arising out of the Postal Service's efforts to change postal rates, suggesting that Congress should examine what legislative and/or administrative changes are needed to reduce the time and expense required to adjust postal rates and better recognize the mission, role, and expectations of the Postal Service in today's communications environment. The final issue that emerged was the extent to which the Postal Service should offer new and nontraditional electronic-based services, such as "E-mail" communication, or stick to hard copy delivery services. While the Postmaster General and other witnesses testified that the Service needs greater authority in introducing new products in its various markets, other witnesses, such as postal competitors, disagreed.

According to the testimony of many witnesses, Congress needs to consider fundamental reform of the quarter-century old Postal Reorganization Act because of the challenges confronting the Postal Service in a changing communications environment. Although the Postal Service expects that overall mail volume will continue to grow in the coming years, advances in communication technology and competition from the private sector could affect the size, structure, and overall mission of the Service that was envisioned by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970. According to many witnesses, the Postal Service's ability to confront these changes is limited by its inability to effectively set prices, introduce new services, or manage the workforce. Several witnesses predicted that absent changes in the law, the next century will see major losses of Postal Service business that could trigger more frequent and larger post-

age increases, and could lead to further reductions in the Service's business.

Although the dozens of witnesses raised a variety of issues and suggested a broad range of proposals for improving mail delivery, no unanimity emerged for any specific approach. However, maintenance of universal service and a need to either strengthen or modify the postal rate setting process were the legislative-related issues consistently discussed by a large majority of witnesses.

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

KEY ISSUES

Four key issues emerged in the oversight hearings. Witnesses discussed these issues most often and as such they appear likely to dominate future congressional debate and deliberations. The most frequently discussed issues included the mail monopoly, labor-management relations, ratemaking, and new postal products.

Under a set of laws known as the Private Express Statutes dating back to the 1700s, private carriers cannot deliver letters unless the Postal Service receives the postage otherwise due on those letters and other conditions are met, such as the letters are placed in a sealed envelope and the envelope is addressed.¹ Many witnesses, such as the Postmaster General, justified the Statutes on a public policy and economic basis. The Postal Service has a statutory mandate to provide universal mail service, and, from an economic theory standpoint, only one supplier (the Postal Service) should deliver mail, lest private carriers capture the easier to serve (i.e., low cost) areas, thereby reducing the overall efficiency of mail delivery services. Many witnesses stated that for these reasons, the monopoly should remain in place. They noted that the 1970 Act has been interpreted to allow the Postal Service to "suspend" any portion of the letter mail stream from the Private Express Statutes; for example, the Postal Service suspended *extremely urgent* letter mail in 1979.² Such mail is often delivered by FedEx or United Parcel Service, among others. However, according to the testimony of the General Accounting Office, more than 80 percent of the total mail volume (177 billion pieces in 1994) is covered by the Private Express Statutes. Other witnesses, such as major mailing groups and postal competitors, testified that the justifications for the mail monopoly are outdated and that Congress should repeal or substantially reduce in scope the Postal Service's exclusive right to deliver letter mail. These witnesses predicted greater efficiency and effectiveness of mail service in the U.S. if changes to the monopoly occurred.

Almost all witnesses testified that longstanding labor relations problems persist on the workroom floor of the Postal Service. Testimony on the subject indicated that unionized organizations like the Postal Service can make little progress in reinventing the organization or changing its culture if relations between management and labor leaders remain adversarial. The Subcommittee heard spirited

¹ 18 U.S.C. §§ 1693–1699 and 39 U.S.C. §§ 601–606. The Act of March 3, 1845, §§ 9–12, 5 Stat. 732, provides the basis of the modern Private Express Statutes.

² 39 C.F.R. § 320.6. The Postal Service has considered that 39 U.S.C. § 601(b) permits it to suspend one or all of the conditions under which letters may be carried outside the mails.

testimony from labor and management representatives on the subject. Both labor and management testified regarding the low level of trust that exists between them, and labor disagreed with the assertion of management and some mailing groups that the collective bargaining process was broken. The General Accounting Office reported that labor-management conflicts on the workroom floor were longstanding and were caused by an autocratic management culture, adversarial employee and union attitudes, and inappropriate and inadequate performance management systems. The key issue seemed to be how Congress and the executive branch could encourage and assist postal management and unions to address these severe labor-management problems.

Nearly all witnesses documented for the Subcommittee the long delays and conflicts arising out of the Postal Service's efforts to change postal rates. Postal Service witnesses, among others, argued that certain pricing criteria contained in the 1970 Act, such as restrictions on volume-based pricing, no longer serve its competitive interests. These witnesses explained to the Subcommittee that past studies had resulted in recommendations (but no substantive actions) to change both the process and the policies governing the revision of postal rates.³ Witnesses recommended a plethora of legislative and administrative changes that they suggested are needed to reduce the time and expense required to adjust postal rates and better recognize the mission, role, and expectations of the Postal Service in today's communications environment. Although some witnesses advocated a complete overhaul of the current rate policy and processes, other mailing groups urged that Congress strengthen the existing system by increasing the powers of the Postal Rate Commission.

The Postmaster General testified, and some mailing groups concurred, that the Postal Service needs greater authority in introducing new products in the various markets. The Postal Service witnesses explained that it has a number of market research efforts underway that could result in new product offerings. For example, in some areas of the country, the Postal Service is offering what it calls "Fastnet," which is next day delivery of parcels ordered over interactive television (the home shopping network). However, other witnesses, notably the Postal Rate Commission, suggested that the Postal Service should stick to hard copy delivery services. The conflicting testimony presents the Subcommittee with the fundamental question of defining the mission of the Postal Service: should Congress encourage or otherwise facilitate the Postal Service's ability to offer new and non-traditional electronic-based services, such as "E-mail" communication, or should Congress require the Postal Service to focus solely on its traditional hard copy delivery services?

³See *Postal Ratemaking in a Time of Change*, a report by the Joint Task Force on Postal Ratemaking submitted to the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service and the Postal Rate Commission, June 1, 1992; *U.S. Postal Service: Pricing Postal Services in a Competitive Environment* a report by the United States General Accounting Office to Congress (GAO/GGD-92-49, Mar. 25, 1992); and *The Ratemaking Process for the U.S. Postal Service*, report of the Institute of Public Administration to the Board of Governors of the U.S. Postal Service (New York: Institute of Public Administration, Oct. 8, 1991).

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARS THAT REFORM IS NEEDED

Many witnesses testified that reform of the Postal Reorganization Act is needed, although they did not agree on whether that meant minor modifications to the current framework or a major overhaul of the existing statute. Almost all witnesses agreed that the Postal Service has come under stress since its establishment in 1970 as a result of new technology and competitors in communications and parcel delivery. The witnesses suggested that this has led to problems with mail service and the loss of substantial portions of Postal Service markets to both electronic media and “hard copy” competitors.

Witnesses reported that the Postal Service lost most of the markets in overnight delivery and parcels to the private sector several years ago. As described by some of the major mailers, the statutory monopoly on letter mail, provided for in the Private Express Statutes, has not stopped the development of alternative means of communications and delivery, and many mailers stated that they are actively seeking out these sources. According to one frequently mentioned scenario, major losses of Postal Service business could trigger more frequent and larger postage increases, and could lead to further reductions in the Service’s business.

Witnesses differed as to whether these problems could be more effectively addressed by better Postal Service management and minor legislative changes or by fully updating the statutory framework. Some critics of the Postal Service, including some mailing groups and competitors, pointed to the Service’s protection from competition, its inability to control costs, and the pay of postal employees as the cause of such problems as delivery delays, losses of mail, and “excessive” increases in postal rates. These witnesses told the Subcommittee that oversight and regulation of the Postal Service should be strengthened.

Other witnesses argued that the Postal Service was disadvantaged by an inherent conflict in its mandate to operate on a self-sustaining businesslike basis while also carrying out a broad mission with public service elements.⁴ Such witnesses suggested that pursuit of these sometimes conflicting goals posed a difficult challenge to the Postal Service in today’s communications environment, and therefore, statutory changes were required to give the Service more flexibility in managing its workforce, setting postal rates, and introducing new products.

DESPITE THE VOICES FOR CHANGE, LITTLE CONSENSUS EMERGES

Although more than thirty-six witnesses testified on the challenges facing the postal system and the need for reform, little consensus developed on specific solutions. Witnesses suggested a variety of general options for improving mail service in the United States, ranging from limited internal reform of the Postal Service to conversion to an entirely private entity that, as a true private corporation, would compete with others to provide mail service. Although no unanimity support emerged for any *specific* approach,

⁴ 39 U.S.C. § 101. Witnesses also suggested that this conflict emerges in the laws pertaining to setting rates and establishing classes of mail (i.e., 39 U.S.C. §§ 3621–3623).

general agreement seemed apparent on maintenance of universal service and reform of postal ratemaking.

With the exception of one major mailing group and one postal competitor, all other witnesses stated that nationwide universal mail service was vitally important to maintain in any U.S. postal system. In addition, most witnesses suggested that Congress should change the postal rate setting process to either (1) streamline the process in order to respond to the challenges of postal competition, or (2) increase regulatory controls of the Postal Service to maintain better oversight of its finances and operations. However, few witnesses offered any specifics on how these changes could be accomplished.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

During his first appearance, Postmaster General Marvin Runyon testified that it was his intent to make the Postal Service more businesslike and more responsive to the American people. He stated that the Postal Service was meeting its mandate to serve the nation by delivering to 125 million addresses each day and providing universal service access to 261 million Americans. Financially, the Postal Service had a preliminary net income of \$531 million during the first five months of the fiscal year, and expenses were running \$176 million below operating estimates. The Postmaster General further stated that after restructuring the Postal Service in 1992, there has been a saving of \$1 billion a year.

However, the Postmaster General indicated that though the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 had worked well, the Act did not envision the highly competitive communications industry that exists today. He said that it is time to reexamine the Act in order to make the Postal Service more competitive by freeing postal employees from bureaucracy and burdensome rules, by simplifying and speeding up the price-setting process to respond to market needs, and by making postal products more customer oriented and modern through pricing flexibility. He also stressed that the Postal Service should be run like a business. The Postmaster General stated that the collective bargaining process is now broken and that the employee dispute resolution mechanisms are faulty.

At the same hearing, the General Accounting Office (GAO) testified that poor labor-management relations continue at the Postal Service and arbitration has been needed to settle four of the six contract negotiations since 1978. Service delivery problems together with continual labor management problems persist. Furthermore, GAO underscored that service and customer satisfaction indicators have remained stagnant over the past years. GAO also reported that postage meter revenue was declining due to fraud and deficiencies in program controls. Furthermore, the implementation of automation continued to be behind schedule and the program had not realized the savings that were anticipated. In the meantime, the private sector with newer technology is replacing some of the conventional types of postal service.

At the second hearing, Postal Rate Commission Chairman Edward Gleiman underscored the important role which the Commission plays in postal affairs because of its mandate to ensure that postal rates and fees are reasonable and equitable. Its primary re-

sponsibility is to recommend postal rates, though only the Postal Service may initiate a rate case. The Rate Commission also hears mail classification proceedings to determine the groupings, classes and subclasses to which rates will be assigned. Currently, there are 17 subclasses of mail and more than 100 worksharing discounts affecting the amounts of postage paid by various mailers. While current law provides that the Commission may take up to 10 months for consideration of an omnibus rate case, Chairman Gleiman emphasized that the Commission rendered its 1994 recommended decision in nine months. The Chairman said that the Commission is interested in streamlining and expediting these proceedings. They initiated meetings with the Postmaster General after the last rate decision and invited public comments on improving the process. The Commission also reissued rules (which went unused for five years) giving the Postal Service the authority to accelerate changes in Express Mail rates to meet market pressures.

Chairman Sam Winters testified on behalf of the Presidentially-appointed Board of Governors at the third hearing. He said the Governors agreed that the Postal Service is one of the most complex enterprises in our country and they are well aware of their responsibilities. They also agreed that though the Postal Service was doing well, it could do better . . . and the same applied to postal employees. The Board has three committees: audit, compensation, and strategic planning. It directs the overall policy of the Postal Service and acts as the people's representative in managing the Postal Service in a businesslike manner. Additionally, the nine Governors determine the amount of mail rate increases. Mr. Winters noted that despite all of these responsibilities, a Governor's compensation is modest and has not been increased in 25 years.

Mr. Winters expressed the Governors' sentiments that mail was being delivered in a timely, reliable manner and that efficiency was improving. However, he thought that operating in a businesslike manner is taxing because of the cumbersome restraints written into the Postal Reorganization Act. For instance, the Service was hampered during the 1992 restructuring because of the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) determination that employees had lost "status" and because the Department of Justice would not represent the Postal Service against the MSPB—the Postal Service must rely on the Department of Justice as it is prohibited from using its own lawyers in a case against a government organization. Mr. Winters also referred to restrictions imposed by Congress in its efforts to support deficit reduction and the Postal Service's inability to be competitive because of the results of collective bargaining. The need for pricing at market rates was preferred to the present method of ratemaking which he said is too time consuming, constraining, and costly; the Postal Service has not been able to offer discounts to high volume mailers in the same manner as the private sector can. In conclusion he stated that the Postal Service should be operated in a businesslike manner and as a modern government enterprise.

Eleven witnesses representing major mailing groups (commercial mailers, publishers, nonprofit mailers) testified at the fourth general oversight hearing. All had distinct opinions on privatization, the usefulness of the Postal Rate Commission, the reform of the

Postal Service and the effect of labor-management relations in the mission of the Postal Service. However, all but one said they were not in favor of privatization of the Postal Service. The Subcommittee heard their various views regarding the Postal Service filing for reclassification.

Postal employee unions and management organizations testified at the fifth hearing. Three of the unions were immersed in contract talks and were critical of management, particularly at postal headquarters. The President of the rural letter carriers union reported that his members had job satisfaction, motivation, and pride in their jobs. They have an evaluated pay system that measures such things as mileage driven and mail volume; these criteria, the Subcommittee was advised, would not be directly transferable to urban carriers. The unions spoke with one voice on retaining universal delivery and uniform postage cost; they testified that the Postal Reorganization Act, including collective bargaining, served them well. Management, they stated, must be streamlined—there are too many intermediate steps diffusing lines of communication. The three management groups focused on labor/management issues, adverse actions, and compensation. These organizations also agreed that though the Postal Service can be improved, the Postal Reorganization Act should not, and need not, be revamped in the area of labor relations but they expressed support for more flexibility on setting rates and introducing new products.

The sixth hearing featured 12 witnesses representing postal related businesses and competitors. The first panel of three included trade associations and a business franchiser. The second panel was composed of postage meter manufacturers and suppliers and the final panel was made up of parcel and urgent mail competitors. These diverse entities expressed varied opinions regarding the letter mail monopoly, the international mail market, the inequity of the Postal Service in being exempted from rules and regulations applicable to private sector businesses (for instance, taxes, parking fines), and the commercial and research value in the sale of postage meters to users in lieu of renting them. Clearly, some of these organizations valued their partnership with the Postal Service whereas others held the Service as an impediment to competition. The hearing explored the extent to which the Postal Service affects business opportunities for small and large concerns, contracting, manufacturing, transportation, inter- and intrastate commerce, and international law.

In Postmaster General Runyon's last appearance before the Subcommittee, he expressed a desire to remain on the job for several more years and appealed to Congress to help him by rewriting the collective bargaining laws that he said have advanced pay for postal workers 20 percent higher than comparable civilian jobs. Mr. Runyon agreed to consider giving postal workers the right to strike, but added that in return management would have to be granted the right to hire replacements for strikers. He suggested providing postal unions the same bargaining rules as railroad workers, under which the President can impose a cooling off period before a strike and can use the power of his office to jawbone the parties into reaching a settlement. The Postmaster General defended his agency, declaring it had "come a long way" since delivery debacles in

1994, and he urged the Subcommittee to reject calls to sell the agency. However, he complained that his efforts to make further gains are hitting a wall of red tape and regulations. The Postmaster General said that he has found a powerful consensus for freeing the nation's mail service from some of its rules and regulations.

The final hearing consisted of an appearance by the Inspector General of the Postal Service, Kenneth Hunter. As he is the watchdog of Postal Service operations, the hearing mainly focused on the operational, financial, and security challenges facing the agency. The Inspector General echoed many of the statutory restrictions on pricing, new products, and managing the workforce that the Postmaster General told the Subcommittee are creating problems for the Postal Service's future viability. Mr. Hunter noted that immediate abolition of the postal monopoly would be devastating to the Postal Service and the concept of universal service. However, he stated that if everything that the Postmaster General wants in the area of postal reform were granted, the monopoly could be eliminated.

ADDITIONAL HEARINGS: H.R. 1963 AND IS IT TIME FOR CHANGE?

The Subcommittee held two additional hearings following completion of the oversight hearings.

In the hearing on H.R. 1963, the Postmark Prompt Payment Act—the Chairman's legislative proposal that would mandate that the date a bill is postmarked is the date it is considered paid—proponents of the measure testified on the legislation. Payments would have to be properly addressed and have adequate postage to qualify under the bill. Stamps, not postage from meters, would be required. Representing the 35 cosponsors, a half-dozen House members testified in support of the bill. Members noted that the bill was needed to address the concerns of conscientious citizens who mail their payment on time but through no fault of their own are assessed late fees and penalties. For example, Representative Andrew Jacobs, Jr. stated that H.R. 1963 “. . . would straighten out a lot of disagreements and save a lot of litigation.”

National radio talk show host Bruce Williams, the driving force behind H.R. 1963, also testified. Mr. Williams, whose show is carried by more than 400 stations, stated that the idea was “a grass roots initiative” that would resolve bill-paying questions faced by all Americans. He presented 4,000 to 5,000 postcards that he has received from his listeners endorsing the measure. Mark Silbergeld, co-director of Consumers Union and also speaking for the Consumer Federation of America, testified in support of the bill as well. He predicted that its passage would prompt businesses to increase pressure on the Postal Service for faster delivery service. Opponents of the measure were invited to testify, but did not do so. Some submitted statements for the record and Chairman McHugh, in acknowledging their concerns, promised to provide them with another opportunity to testify during the second session of the 104th Congress.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on postal reform. Witnesses discussed whether, and in what manner, the quarter-century old Postal Reorganization Act should be changed. In the first

of what is planned as a series of hearings on the subject, the Subcommittee heard from a number of witnesses whose views spanned the spectrum of perspectives on postal legislative reform. Representatives Phil Crane and Dana Rohrabacher, cosponsors of H.R. 210, discussed their bill which would turn the Postal Service over to its employees under an employee stock ownership program. Both lawmakers argued that the Postal Service is on the verge of a crisis as electronic communication diverts more first-class mail from the agency, and that the Subcommittee needs to act before the crisis arrives.

The Subcommittee also heard testimony it requested from the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress on options for reform of the Postal Service, as well as former Postmaster General Anthony Frank, former Postal Rate Commissioner Patti Birge Tyson, and Murray Comarow, a member of the Kappel Commission whose recommendations became the basis of the 1970 Act. In its testimony, the Research Service presented its findings of what was ailing the Postal Service, describing many of the technological and competitive challenges confronting the Service as well as the problems presented by the mandate to operate on a businesslike basis while carrying out a broad public service. Although several options for reform were described, the Research Service noted that the ultimate solution is "an issue for political resolution." Although Ms. Tyson advocated that the Subcommittee keep the current structure while providing some flexibility in pricing, Mr. Frank and Mr. Comarow proposed more fundamental changes. Both criticized the power postal unions have amassed since the Postal Service was created in 1971 and further criticized the lack of supervision that the Postal Service's Governors give the agency. Mr. Comarow outlined a variety of areas for the Subcommittee to examine, but ultimately concluded that a second commission was needed to study postal issues. Mr. Frank argued that top postal executives need to be paid more and that the Postal Service needs less regulation from the Postal Rate Commission.

APPENDIX I—GENERAL OVERSIGHT HEARINGS 1995

February 23, 1995

WITNESSES: Postal Service and the General Accounting Office
Marvin T. Runyon, U.S. Postal Service
Michael E. Motley, General Accounting Office

March 2, 1995

WITNESSES: Postal Rate Commission
Edward J. Gleiman
W.H. LeBlanc
George W. Haley
Edward Quick Jr.
Wayne A. Schley

March 8, 1995

WITNESSES: Postal Service Governors
Sam Winters
LeGree S. Daniels
Einar V. Dyhrkopp
Susan E. Alvarado
Bert H. Mackie
Norma Pace

May 23, 1995

WITNESSES: Major mailing groups and organizations
Art Sackler, Mailers Council
Ian D. Volner, Advertising Mail Marketing Association
Richard Barton, Direct Marketing Association
David Todd, Mail Order Association of America
Timothy May, Parcel Shippers Association
Tonda Rush, National Newspaper Association
Cathleen P. Black, Newspaper Association of America
George Gross, Magazine Publishers of America
Steve Bair, Association of American Publishers
Alan Kline, Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers
Lee Cassidy, National Federation of Nonprofits

June 7, 1995

WITNESSES: Postal employee and management groups
Moe Biller, American Postal Workers Union
Vincent Sombrotto, National Association of Letter Carriers
Scottie Hicks, National Rural Letter Carriers Association
William Quinn, National Postal Mail Handlers Union
W. David Games, National Association of Postmasters
Bill Brennan, National League of Postmasters

Vincent Palladino, National Association of Postal Supervisors

June 14, 1995

WITNESSES: Postal reliant business and competitors

John V. Maraney, National Star Route Mail Contractors Association

Randall Holleschau, National Association of Presort Mailers

Don Harle, Mail Advertising Service Association

Robert Muma, Envelope Manufacturers Association of America

Anthony W. Desio, Mail Boxes, Etc.

Kathleen Synnott, Pitney Bowes

Neal Mahlstedt, Ascom Hasler

Michael A. Allocca, Friden Neopost

George W. Gelfer, Postalia

James Rogers, United Parcel Service

James Campbell, Federal Express

Peter N. Hiebert, DHL Worldwide

Harry Geller, Air Courier Conference of America

June 28, 1995

WITNESSES: Postal Service

Marvin Runyon, Postmaster General

Michael Coughlin, Deputy Postmaster General

July 25, 1995

WITNESSES: Postal Service Inspector General

Kenneth J. Hunter, Inspector General

ADDITIONAL HEARINGS 1995

October 19, 1995

WITNESSES: Proponents of H.R. 1963

Representative Sherwood Boehlert, Member of Congress, 23rd District/New York

Representative Andrew Jacobs, Member of Congress, 10th District/Indiana

Representative Steve Stockman, Member of Congress, 9th District/Texas

Representative Thomas Barrett, Member of Congress, 5th District/Wisconsin

Representative Peter Blute, Member of Congress, 3rd District/Massachusetts

Resident Commissioner Carlos Romero-Barceló, Puerto Rico

Mark Silbergeld, Consumers Union

Bruce Williams, syndicated radio talk show host

November 15, 1995

WITNESSES: Individuals discussing reform of the Postal Reorganization Act

Representative Philip Crane, Member of Congress, 8th District/Illinois

Representative Dana Rohrabacher, Member of Congress,
45th District/California
Congressional Research Service
Anthony M. Frank, former Postmaster General
Patti Birge Tyson, former Postal Rate Commissioner
Murray Comarow, former Executive Director of Kappel Com-
mission

